



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/750,104	12/29/2000	Samuel N. Zellner	BS00-027	6281
28970	7590	06/18/2004	EXAMINER	
SHAW PITTMAN IP GROUP 1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD SUITE 1300 MCLEAN, VA 22102			SHERKAT, AREZOO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2131	8

DATE MAILED: 06/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/750,104

Applicant(s)

ZELLNER ET AL.

Examiner

Arezoo Sherkat

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 December 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3&amp;6</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-44 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12, 15-22, 25-26, and 29-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monroe, (U.S. Patent No. 6,545,601 and Monroe hereinafter), in view of Amini et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,698,021 and Amini hereinafter), in further view of Vaio, (U.S. Patent No. 6,271,752 and Vaio hereinafter).

Regarding claim 1, Monroe discloses a system for controlling devices at a location by an outside entity, the system comprising:

(a) at least one device installed at the location (Col. 12, lines 6-67 and Col. 13, lines 1-9);

(b) an internal computer system in communication with the device, wherein the internal computer system is adapted to control the device (Col. 13, lines 55-67 and Col. 14, lines 1-9);

wherein when a triggering event is detected at the location, one of the internal computer system and the outside entity initiates a communication session between the internal computer system and the outside entity (Col. 5, lines 17-50).

Although Monroe discloses firewalls may be implemented to protect access (Col. 18, lines 4-26), Monroe does not expressly disclose a firewall to verify identity information associated with the outside entity.

However, Amini discloses

(c) a firewall in communication with the internal computer system, wherein the firewall is adapted to verify identity information associated with the outside entity, wherein the outside entity provides identity information to the firewall, and wherein the firewall allows the outside entity to control the device through the internal computer system if the firewall recognizes the identity information (Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Monroe with the teachings of Amini because it would allow to include a firewall to verify identity information associated with the outside entity with the motivation to provide for an increased confidentiality of video images obtained by the surveillance and monitoring operation (Amini, Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Regarding claim 15, Monroe discloses a method for controlling devices at a location by an outside entity, the method comprising the steps of:

(a) associating at least one device with an internal computer system at the location (Col. 12, lines 6-67 and Col. 13, lines 1-9);

(b) requesting the outside entity to control the at least one device, and (c) establishing a communication session between the outside entity and the internal computer system (Col. 5, lines 17-50 and Col. 13, lines 55-67 and Col. 14, lines 1-9).

Although Monroe discloses firewalls may be implemented to protect access (Col. 18, lines 4-26), Monroe does not expressly disclose authenticating the identity of the outside entity, and (e) allowing the outside entity to control the at least one device through the internal computer system.

However, Amini discloses

(d) authenticating the identity of the outside entity, and (e) allowing the outside entity to control the at least one device through the internal computer system (Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Monroe with the teachings of Amini because it would allow to include a firewall to verify identity information associated with the outside entity with the motivation to provide for an increased confidentiality of video images obtained by the surveillance and monitoring operation (Amini, Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Claims 13-14, 27-28, and 31-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monroe, (U.S. Patent No. 6,545,601 and Monroe hereinafter), in view

of Amini et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,698,021 and Amini hereinafter), in further view of Vaios, (U.S. Patent No. 6,271,752 and Vaios hereinafter).

Regarding claims 13, 14, 27, and 28, Monroe or Amini does not expressly disclose wherein the communication session uses transmission control protocol and/or digital communications protocol.

However, Vaios discloses wherein the communication session uses transmission control protocol and or digital communications protocol (Col. 6, lines 54-67 and Col. 7, lines 1-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the combined teachings of Monroe and Amini with the teachings of Vaios because it would allow to include wherein the communication session uses transmission control protocol and/or digital communications protocol with the motivation to provide for an inexpensive multi-access remote system that enables individuals to access remotely a security surveillance or other video system area and appropriately monitor and operate this area as desired (Vaios, Col. 1, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 31, Monroe discloses a system for enabling an outside entity to control devices at a location, the system comprising:

(a) an internal computer system associated with the location (Col. 12, lines 6-67 and Col. 13, lines 1-9);

(b) a sensing apparatus associated with the internal computer system, wherein the sensing apparatus can detect a triggering event at the location wherein when the sensing apparatus detects the triggering event the internal computer system establishes a communication session with the outside entity via an external computer network (Col. 5, lines 17-50).

Although Monroe discloses firewalls may be implemented to protect access (Col. 18, lines 4-26), Monroe does not expressly disclose a firewall to verify identity information associated with the outside entity.

However, Amini discloses

(c) a firewall in communication with the internal computer system, wherein the firewall is adapted to verify identity information associated with the outside entity, and (d) a device associated with the internal computer system, wherein the device can be controlled by the outside entity via the internal computer system, wherein the outside entity provides identity information to the internal computer system, wherein the firewall creates a secured tunnel for the outside entity to access the internal computer system, wherein the outside entity uses information retrieved from a database to control the device during the communication session (Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Monroe or Amini does not expressly disclose wherein only the outside entity can terminate the communication session.

However, Vaio discloses wherein only the outside entity can terminate the communication session (Col. 8, lines 35-67 and Col. 9, lines 1-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Monroe with the teachings of Amini because it would allow to include a firewall to verify identity information associated with the outside entity with the motivation to provide for an increased confidentiality of video images obtained by the surveillance and monitoring operation (Amini, Col. 6, lines 12-34), and to modify the combined teachings of Monroe and Amini with the teachings of Vaios because it would allow to include wherein only the outside entity can terminate the communication session with the motivation to provide for an inexpensive multi-access remote system that enables individuals to access remotely a security surveillance or other video system area and appropriately monitor and operate this area as desired (Vaios, Col. 1, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 36, Monroe discloses a method for enabling an outside entity to control devices at a location, the method comprising the steps of

(a) associating at least one device with an internal computer system at the location (Col. 12, lines 6-67 and Col. 13, lines 1-9);

(b) reporting a triggering event associated with the location to the outside entity, and (c) initiating a communication session between the internal computer system and the outside entity through an external computer network, wherein the communication session is initiated by the internal computer network (Col. 5, lines 17-50 and Col. 13, lines 55-67 and Col. 14, lines 1-9).



Although Monroe discloses firewalls may be implemented to protect access (Col. 18, lines 4-26), Monroe does not expressly disclose verifying identity information provided by the outside entity, and allowing the outside entity to control the device during the communication session.

However, Amini discloses

(d) verifying identity information provided by the outside entity, and (e) allowing the outside entity to control the device during the communication session (Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Monroe or Amini does not expressly disclose wherein only the outside entity can terminate the communication session.

However, Vaios discloses wherein only the outside entity can terminate the communication session (Col. 8, lines 35-67 and Col. 9, lines 1-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Monroe with the teachings of Amini because it would allow to include a firewall to verify identity information associated with the outside entity with the motivation to provide for an increased confidentiality of video images obtained by the surveillance and monitoring operation (Amini, Col. 6, lines 12-34), and to modify the combined teachings of Monroe and Amini with the teachings of Vaios because it would allow to include wherein only the outside entity can terminate the communication session with the motivation to provide for an inexpensive multi-access remote system that enables individuals to access

remotely a security surveillance or other video system area and appropriately monitor and operate this area as desired (Vaio, Col. 1, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 41, Monroe discloses a method for enabling an outside entity to handle a situation at a location, the method comprising the steps of:

(a) associating at least one device with an internal computer system at the location (Col. 12, lines 6-67 and Col. 13, lines 1-9);

(b) reporting a triggering event associated with the situation at the location to the outside entity, and (c) initiating a communication session between the internal computer system and the outside entity through an external computer network (Col. 5, lines 17-50 and Col. 13, lines 55-67 and Col. 14, lines 1-9).

Although Monroe discloses firewalls may be implemented to protect access (Col. 18, lines 4-26), Monroe does not expressly disclose providing first and second identity information associated with the internal computer system to the outside entity and authenticating both the first identity information and the second identity information.

However, Amini discloses

(d) providing a first identity information associated with the internal computer system to the outside entity, (e) providing a second identity information associated with the outside entity to the internal computer system, (f) authenticating both the first identity information and the second identity information: (g) establishing a secured tunnel through a firewall associated with the internal computer system if both the first identity information and the second identity information are authenticated, and (h)

allowing the outside entity to control the device to handle the situation during the communication session (Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Monroe or Amini does not expressly disclose wherein only the outside entity can terminate the communication session.

However, Vaios discloses wherein only the outside entity can terminate the communication session (Col. 8, lines 35-67 and Col. 9, lines 1-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Monroe with the teachings of Amini because it would allow to include a firewall to verify identity information associated with the outside entity with the motivation to provide for an increased confidentiality of video images obtained by the surveillance and monitoring operation (Amini, Col. 6, lines 12-34), and to modify the combined teachings of Monroe and Amini with the teachings of Vaios because it would allow to include wherein only the outside entity can terminate the communication session with the motivation to provide for an inexpensive multi-access remote system that enables individuals to access remotely a security surveillance or other video system area and appropriately monitor and operate this area as desired (Vaios, Col. 1, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 2, Monroe discloses wherein control of the communication session rests exclusively with the outside entity (i.e., ground station remotely monitors and controls the commercial transport onboard systems)(Col. 3, lines 25-55).

Regarding claims 3 and 19, Monroe discloses wherein the outside entity is an emergency response unit (Col. 7, lines 10-37).

Regarding claim 4, Monroe discloses wherein the emergency response unit is a public safety answering point (i.e., the ground station may also send operational commands to the various monitoring systems both onboard the transport and ground mounted, such as camera tilt, pan and zoom and sensor activation. Other command signals such as "lock-on" a specific condition or transport, sensor download, activation such as "lights-on" or alarm, e.g., siren, activation and the like)(Col. 7, lines 10-37).

Regarding claims 5 and 20, Monroe discloses wherein the outside entity is a private security firm (Col. 7, lines 10-37).

Regarding claims 6 and 32, Monroe does not expressly disclose wherein the identity information is a password.

However, Amini discloses wherein the identity information is a password (Col. 6, lines 13-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Monroe with the teachings of Amini because it would allow to include an identity information such as a password with the motivation to provide for an increased confidentiality of video images obtained by the surveillance and monitoring operation (Amini, Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Regarding claims 7 and 33, Monroe does not expressly disclose wherein the identity information is a digital certificate.

However, Amini discloses wherein the identity information is a digital certificate (i.e., x.509 certificate)(Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Monroe with the teachings of Amini because it would allow to include an identity information such as a digital certificate with the motivation to provide for an increased confidentiality of video images obtained by the surveillance and monitoring operation (Amini, Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Regarding claims 8 and 34, Monroe does not expressly disclose wherein the digital certificate is issued and authenticated by a certificate authority.

However, Amini discloses wherein the digital certificate is issued and authenticated by a certificate authority (Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Monroe with the teachings of Amini because it would allow to include wherein the digital certificate is issued and authenticated by a certificate authority with the motivation to provide for an increased confidentiality of video images obtained by the surveillance and monitoring operation (Amini, Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Regarding claim 9, Monroe discloses further comprising a sensing apparatus in communication with the internal computer system, wherein the triggering event is detected by the sensing apparatus (Col. 6, lines 30-52).

Regarding claims 10 and 17, Monroe discloses wherein the at least one device is an observation device (i.e., camera)(Col. 4, lines 47-65).

Regarding claims 11 and 18, Monroe discloses wherein the at least one device is an emergency response device (i.e., sensors are triggered/activated and only signals generated thereby are transmitted to the security station)(Col. 6, lines 30-53).

Regarding claims 12 and 22, Monroe discloses wherein the internal computer system is a local area network (Col. 3, lines 55-67).

Regarding claim 16, Monroe discloses wherein only the outside entity can terminate the communication session (i.e., ground station remotely monitors and controls the commercial transport onboard systems)(Col. 3, lines 25-55).

Regarding claim 21, Monroe discloses wherein the outside entity is a healthcare provider (Col. 7, lines 10-37).

Regarding claim 25 and 26, Monroe discloses further comprising the step of transferring the communication session from the outside entity to a third party and wherein the third party is an emergency response unit (Col. 7, lines 10-37).

Regarding claim 29, Monroe does not expressly disclose wherein the identity of the outside entity is authenticated by a certificate authority.

However, Amini discloses wherein the identity of the outside entity is authenticated by a certificate authority (Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Monroe with the teachings of Amini because it would allow to include wherein the identity of the outside entity is authenticated by a certificate authority with the motivation to provide for an increased confidentiality of video images obtained by the surveillance and monitoring operation (Amini, Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Regarding claim 30, Monroe does not expressly disclose wherein the identity of the outside entity is authenticated by the internal computer system based on a password provided by the outside entity.

However, Amini discloses wherein the identity of the outside entity is authenticated by the internal computer system based on a password provided by the outside entity (Col. 6, lines 13-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Monroe with the teachings of Amini because it would allow to include wherein the identity of the outside entity is authenticated by the internal computer system based on a password provided by the outside entity with the motivation to provide for an increased confidentiality of video images obtained by the surveillance and monitoring operation (Amini, Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Regarding claim 35, Monroe does not expressly disclose wherein the external computer network is the Internet.

However, Amini discloses wherein the external computer network is the Internet (Col. 13, lines 40-51).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Monroe with the teachings of Amini because it would allow to include wherein the external computer network is the Internet with the motivation to facilitate connection between client workstations and off-site server (Amini, Col. 13, lines 40-51).

Regarding claim 37, Monroe does not expressly disclose wherein the identity information is a password issued to the outside entity by the internal computer system.

However, Amini discloses wherein the identity information is a password issued to the outside entity by the internal computer system (Col. 6, lines 13-34).



Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Monroe with the teachings of Amini because it would allow to include an identity information such as a password with the motivation to provide for an increased confidentiality of video images obtained by the surveillance and monitoring operation (Amini, Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Regarding claim 38, Monroe discloses wherein the identity information is a digital certificate issued to the outside entity by a certificate authority.

However, Amini discloses wherein the identity information is a digital certificate issued to the outside entity by a certificate authority (Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Monroe with the teachings of Amini because it would allow to include wherein the identity information is a digital certificate issued to the outside entity by a certificate authority with the motivation to provide for an increased confidentiality of video images obtained by the surveillance and monitoring operation (Amini, Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Regarding claim 39, Monroe does not expressly disclose wherein the step of verifying the identity information of the outside entity is performed by the certificate authority.

However, Amini discloses wherein the step of verifying the identity information of the outside entity is performed by the certificate authority (Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Monroe with the teachings of Amini because it would allow to include wherein the step of verifying the identity information of the outside entity is performed by the certificate authority with the motivation to provide for an increased confidentiality of video images obtained by the surveillance and monitoring operation (Amini, Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Regarding claim 40, Monroe does not expressly disclose further comprising the step of authenticating identity of the internal computer system for the outside entity.

However, Amini discloses further comprising the step of authenticating identity of the internal computer system for the outside entity further comprising the step of authenticating identity of the internal computer system for the outside entity (i.e., the client certificates enable client workstation 322 and off-site server 332 to authenticate each other and to negotiate cryptographic keys to be used in a secure socket layer (SSL) communication session)(Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Monroe with the teachings of Amini because it would allow to include the step of authenticating identity of the internal computer system for the outside entity further comprising the step of authenticating identity of the internal computer system for the outside entity with the motivation to provide for an increased confidentiality of video images obtained by the surveillance and monitoring operation (Amini, Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Regarding claim 42, Monroe does not expressly disclose wherein the first identity information is a first digital certificate issued to the internal computer system by a certificate authority.

However, Amini discloses wherein the first identity information is a first digital certificate issued to the internal computer system by a certificate authority (i.e., the client certificates enable client workstation 322 and off-site server 332 to authenticate each other and to negotiate cryptographic keys to be used in a secure socket layer (SSL) communication session)(Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Monroe with the teachings of Amini because it would allow to include wherein the step of verifying the identity information of the outside entity is performed by the certificate authority with the motivation to provide for an increased confidentiality of video images obtained by the surveillance and monitoring operation (Amini, Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Regarding claim 43, Monroe does not expressly disclose wherein the second identity information is a second digital certificate issued to the outside entity by a certificate authority.

However, Amini discloses wherein the second identity information is a second digital certificate issued to the outside entity by a certificate authority (i.e., the client certificates enable client workstation 322 and off-site server 332 to authenticate each

other and to negotiate cryptographic keys to be used in a secure socket layer (SSL) communication session)(Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Monroe with the teachings of Amini because it would allow to include wherein the step of verifying the identity information of the outside entity is performed by the certificate authority with the motivation to provide for an increased confidentiality of video images obtained by the surveillance and monitoring operation (Amini, Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Regarding claim 44, Monroe does not expressly disclose wherein the step of authenticating both the first identity information and the second identity information is performed by a certificate authority.

However, Amini discloses wherein the step of authenticating both the first identity information and the second identity information is performed by a certificate authority (i.e., the client certificates enable client workstation 322 and off-site server 332 to authenticate each other and to negotiate cryptographic keys to be used in a secure socket layer (SSL) communication session)(Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Monroe with the teachings of Amini because it would allow to include wherein the step of verifying the identity information of the outside entity is performed by the certificate authority with the

motivation to provide for an increased confidentiality of video images obtained by the surveillance and monitoring operation (Amini, Col. 6, lines 12-34).

Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monroe, (U.S. Patent No. 6,545,601 and Monroe hereinafter), in view of Amini et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,698,021 and Amini hereinafter), in further view of Engelhorn et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,317,042 and Engelhorn hereinafter).

Regarding claims 23 and 24, Monroe or Amini does not expressly disclose wherein the internal computer system is Bluetooth compatible and at least one device is Bluetooth-enabled.

However, discloses wherein the internal computer system is Bluetooth compatible and at least one device is Bluetooth-enabled (Col. 3, lines 25-67 and Col. 4, lines 1-44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the combined teachings of Monroe and Amini with the teachings of Engelhorn because it would allow to include wherein the internal computer system is Bluetooth compatible and at least one device is Bluetooth-enabled with the motivation to provide for an emergency announcement system that displays an escape route for occupants of a building (Engelhorn, Col. 1, lines 1-20).

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Monroe, (U.S. Patent No. 6,246,320),

Frailong et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,012,100), and

Peters, (U.S. Patent No. 5,717,379).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arezoo Sherkat whose telephone number is (703) 305-8749. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30 Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/750,104  
Art Unit: 2131

Page 22

*A. Sherkat*

Arezoo Sherkat  
Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2100  
June 7, 2004

*Ayaz Sheikh*  
AYAZ SHEIKH

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100